Best Available Copy Application No. Applicant(s) 09/600.788 CHENEY ET AL. **Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary Art Unit** 1797 N. Bhat All Participants: **Status of Application** (1) N. Bhat. (3)(2) G. McGowan. Date of Interview: 17 January 2008 Time: Type of Interview: ☐ Video Conference → ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: Claims discussed: 7 and 17 Prior art documents discussed: None Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. 194 (5) 25.4 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 09/600,788

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested that in step (i), the recitation of a step of rapidly freezing a food composition comprising AFPs" for clarity purposes. The examiner also indicated that claim 17 shoul dnot depend from claim 8 but from claim 2. Applicant's representative authorized changes by examiner's amendment.